

REMARKS

These remarks are made responsive to the non-final office action mailed October 25, 2005.

Amendments to the Specification and Drawing Objections

Paragraph 20 has been replaced with a new paragraph 20 including the reference numeral 210 in order to comply with 37 C.F.R. 1.84(p)(5).

Amendments to the Claims and Drawing Objections

Claims 22 and 24 have been amended to overcome the drawing objection under 37 CFR 1.83(a).

Claim 22 has been amended to indicate that "product type" rather than "product code" is indicative of a product selected from the group consisting of an operating system, a hardware component, a network device, an application, and a security feature. Support for this claim amendment can be found on pages 7, paragraph [0024] to page 8 including the illustrative examples of product type in Tables 3, 4, 5 and 6. The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the objection to claim 22 in view of this amendment.

Claim 24 has been amended to indicate some possible values for the business designation field from "a group of values representing business types of systems consisting of production, solutions testing, development and a disaster recovery." Support for this amendment can be found beginning on page 7, paragraph [0022] including Table 1. Business Designations which illustrates some possible values for this field. Typically, possible values for a field are represented in a table in the specification. A drawing to illustrate possible values in a table would not provide additional structural features to the already existing Figures 1, 2 and 3. The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the objection to claim 24.

Status of the Pending Claims

Claims 19 and 21-26 are pending in this application. Claims 1-18 and 20 have been cancelled. Claims 19, 21- 24 have been amended. Claims 25-26 remain unamended. Reconsideration of these claims for allowance is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Claim Objections

Dependent claim 21 has been amended to replace [[an]] with and. Claim 23 has been amended to depend from independent claim 19.

35 U.S.C § 112

Claim 21 has been amended to remove "a type" in line 3.

35 U.S.C. 102(e)

Independent claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Nakamura (U.S. Patent No. 6,226,134 B1). In order for a reference to anticipate a claim, the reference must teach each and every element of the claim. Nakamura does not teach the structure of claim 19 which requires "an event manager; and mid-level managers coupled to said event manager; wherein said mid-level managers are adapted to receive error messages from disparate client monitoring agents." Nakamura only has a two level system of service monitor units (See Figure 1 and 2, 14) and manager units (See Figure 1 and 2, 12). Thus Nakamura does not teach the relationship between the "event manager, the mid-level managers and the disparate client monitoring agents."

35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Additionally, claim 19 has been amended to include limitations of now cancelled claim 20 by reciting "said business string includes a plurality of fields of information ~~indicative of the nature of an error~~ including a customer identifier, and a product type."

Former claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Nakamura in view of Hirose et al. (US Patent No. 5,237,677) and further in view of Burgess et al. (US Patent No. 5,696,701). For a 103 obviousness rejection, each element of the claim must be disclosed in the references in view of the ordinary skill in the art and one of ordinary skill in the art must be motivated to combine the references to make or use the claimed invention.

As acknowledged in the office action, Nakamura fails to disclose a customer identifier, a product code and a product type. For the customer identifier, Hirose's "site identifier" is cited. However, a site identifier is directed at identifying a location, a site, and not a customer. A customer is not necessarily associated with a particular site, nor a site with a customer. One site can serve many customers. A site can refer to one's own premises and not be linked to a customer at all. None of these three references associate a site with a customer. Hence, none of the references disclose or provide motivation to one of ordinary skill in the art to include a customer identifier within a standardized format of an error message.

Additionally, the reference to Hirosawa's 16c field does not disclose a product type, but what Hirosawa describes as a "fault species (type) field" (See Col. 13, lines 7-8). A species is a way of describing generally how technology is implemented but fails to identify a product such as a hardware component or a security feature for which an error message was generated. The values the "fault species (type) field" can take on are as follows:

"In the case of a software fault, the value in the fault species field 16c is set to "S," (Col. 13, lines 8-10) and a "hardware fault is represented by "H". (Col. 13, line 49). An indication of a species of a hardware or software fault provides no indication of which software or hardware product failed which a product type does.

One of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to provide an *error* message with a standardized format including a business string including a customer identifier for identifying the customer experiencing the error, as well as a product type of the product causing the error based on the combination of the fault monitoring systems of Nakamura and Hirosawa with the configuration monitoring of Burgess et al. The configuration procedure 44 of Burgess's Figure 3 is a separate process altogether from its alert thread 48 and log capture thread 46 which feed into an event queue 52. (See Figure 3 and (Col. 5, line 52 to col. 6, line 10). Configuration management is handled separately from alerts thus teaching away from including the recited elements of the standardized business string in an error message to identify the customer and that customer's product that has caused the error. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the rejection to claim 19 be withdrawn.

Claim 21 has been amended to clarify that "a business designation [is] indicative of a business type of system." None of the references are concerned with relating fault information back to the effect on the customer's business. A business type tells the kind of work in the business effected by the product having the error. This is a useful feature in prioritizing which errors must be fixed first. Therefore, none of the references alone or in combination disclose or provide any motivation to make the invention as recited in claim 21. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the rejection to claim 21 be withdrawn.

Claim 22 depends from claim 19 so the arguments applicable to claim 19 are applicable to claim 22 as well. Furthermore, Nakamura in view of Hirosawa in view of Burgess does not teach suggest or motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to include a product type in the business string of an error message, much less a "product

type [that] is indicative of a product selected from the group consisting of an operating system, a hardware component, a network device, an application, and a security feature.” Thus, it is respectfully requested that the rejection to claim 22 be withdrawn.

Claim 23 depends from claim 19 so the arguments applicable to claim 19 are applicable to claim 23 as well. Furthermore, Nakamura in view of Hirose in view of Burgess does not teach, suggest or motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to include a product type in the business string of an error message, much less a “product type [that] is indicative of a type corresponding to the product code.” Thus, it is respectfully requested that the rejection to claim 23 be withdrawn.

Claim 24 depends from claim 21 so the arguments applicable to claim 21 are applicable to claim 24 as well. Furthermore, Nakamura in view of Hirose in view of Burgess does not teach suggest or motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to include a business designation in the business string of an error message, much less a “business designation [that] is selected from a group of values representing business types of systems consisting of production, solutions testing, development, and a disaster recovery recovery.” Thus, it is respectfully requested that the rejection to claim 24 be withdrawn.

Claims 25 and 26 depend from claim 19 so the arguments applicable to claim 19 are also applicable to claims 25 and 26 as well. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the rejection to claims 25 and 26 be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In light of the arguments presented above, pending claims 19 and 21-26 as amended are in condition for allowance, and applicants respectfully request a prompt notice of allowance.

Date: *Feb. 27, 2006*

Respectfully Submitted on Behalf of Applicant
Anthony G.J. Parsons and William R. Purvis

Eileen Lehmann

Eileen Lehmann
Registration No. 39,272
Hewlett-Packard Company

Mail Stop 1197
1501 Page Mill Road
Palo Alto, CA 94304
650-857-7940 (telephone)
650-852-8063 (fax)